



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,292	10/27/2003	Justine Coates	MS1-1642US	2778
22801	7590	01/29/2009		
LEE & HAYES, PLLC 601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER KARDOS, NEIL R	
			ART UNIT 3623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/29/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,292

Applicant(s)

COATES ET AL.

Examiner

Neil R. Kardos

Art Unit

3623

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 and 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is a **FINAL** Office action on the merits in response to communications filed on November 10, 2008. Claims 11 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-10 and 14-15 have been cancelled. Claim 23 has been added. Currently, claims 11-13 and 16-23 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendments to claim 11 are sufficient to overcome the rejection under § 101 as set forth in the previous Office action. Accordingly, this rejection is withdrawn.

Applicant's amendments to the claims are sufficient to overcome the rejections under § 103 as set forth in the previous Office action. Additional prior art has been applied to the amended claims below; the new grounds of rejection including this prior art is necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent number 6,944,539 to Yamada et al ("Yamada") in view of U.S. patent number

6,266,295 to Parker et al (“Parker”), and further in view of U.S. patent number 6,321,158 to Delorme (“DeLorme”).

Claim 11: Yamada discloses a processor-readable medium comprising processor-executable instructions that, when executed on one or more processors, perform acts comprising:

- receiving scheduling information including event times, event locations, and event details (see column 4: lines 38-47; column 5: lines 1-12; column 6: lines 10-30; figure 3);
- accessing a map that encompasses the event locations for each event location (see column 4: lines 38-47; column 6: lines 10-30; figure 3),

Yamada does not explicitly disclose for each event location, expressing event times in a single illustrated clock face. However, Yamada does disclose expressing event times as a desired arrival time (see column 6: lines 22-24). Parker teaches displaying event times in a single illustrated clock face (see at least figures 10-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the event arrival times taught by Yamada with the clock face taught by Parker. This combination of known elements produces a result that would be predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g. desired arrival times are displayed on a single analog clock face rather than as a digital time).

Yamada also does not explicitly disclose displaying each clock face on the map at its corresponding event location. However, Yamada does disclose displaying desired arrival times for destinations on a map (see column 6: lines 22-24). Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the navigational device and graphical user interface arts at the time the invention was made to place graphical objects at a destination or waypoint (For example, a flag marking a

destination or a symbol representing a waypoint [gas station, bank, etc.]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the desired arrival times taught by Yamada (in the analog form taught by Parker) at their corresponding destination points. This combination of known elements produces a result that would be predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g. a display with arrival times rather than flags or other associated symbols located at destinations).

Finally, Yamada does not explicitly disclose:

- receiving a user input instruction from a cursor hovering over an event time in the single spatial view; and
- in response to the user input instruction, displaying a pop-up pane containing underlying event information associated with the event time.

DeLorme discloses these limitations (see column 43: line 63 through column 44: line 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the techniques taught by DeLorme to display information on the map of Yamada. This combination of known elements produces a result that would be predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g. viewing information by hovering a cursor over an item [similar to a ToolTip]).

Claim 13: Yamada discloses a computer including the processor-readable medium of claim 11 (see column 2: line 63 through column 3: line 7).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Parker and Delorme, and further in view of Springfield Bus Route Service ("Springfield BRS"), accessed at www.cityutilities.net/services/ser_route.htm via the Wayback machine at www.archive.org on November 5, 2002.

Claim 12: Yamada does not explicitly disclose wherein the expressing event times comprises:

- expressing AM hours in which an event can occur as an inner circle partitioned into an AM event-on section and an AM event-off section;
- expressing PM hours in which an event can occur as a first ring surrounding the inner circle, the first ring partitioned into a PM event-on section and a PM event-off section;
- expressing an event time as a clock hand extending radially away from the center of the inner circle in a direction which expresses a particular minute in an analog clock hour;
- wherein the event occurs at the particular minute for every hour of the AM event-on section and every hour of the PM event-on section.

Parker discloses expressing event times in partitioned regions of an AM circle and a PM circle of a clock face (see figures 11A-11B).

Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the art at the time the invention was made to express an event time as a clock hand extending radially away from the center of the inner circle in a direction which expresses a particular minute in an analog clock hour (e.g. an analog clock).

Springfield BRS discloses wherein an event occurs at a particular minute for every hour of the AM event-on section and every hour of the PM event-on section (see any of the bus schedules/timetables, disclosing when the first AM bus arrives and when the last PM bus arrives, as well as the particular minute after every hour that the bus arrives).

Thus, depicting events that occur at particular minutes of particular hours is known in the art (as shown in Springfield BRS). Further, partitioning portions of an analog clock into event-on and event-off sections is known in the art (as shown in Parker). Additionally, expressing event times as a clock hand is known in the art (as demonstrated by Official Notice). Finally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine these known elements because it produces a predictable result (e.g. the bus schedule shown in Springfield BRS depicted on a clock face).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker in view of Springfield BRS.

Claim 16: Parker discloses a method comprising:

- expressing multiple event times of one or more events on a single analog clock face;
- wherein the clock face includes an inner circle depicting active AM hours in which event times may occur, a first concentric ring around the inner circle depicting active PM hours in which event times may occur, a second concentric ring around the first concentric ring, the second concentric ring depicting time markings consistent with an analog clock, and event hands extending from the

center of the inner circle to the outer edge of the second concentric ring (see figures 11A-11B).

Parker does not explicitly disclose each event hand designating a particular minute in an analog clock hour when an event of the one or more events will occur for every active AM hours and for every active PM hour.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the art at the time the invention was made to express an event time as a clock hand extending radially away from the center of the inner circle in a direction which expresses a particular minute in an analog clock hour (e.g. an analog clock).

Springfield BRS discloses wherein an event occurs at a particular minute for every hour of the AM event-on section and every hour of the PM event-on section (see any of the bus schedules/timetables, disclosing when the first AM bus arrives and when the last PM bus arrives, as well as the particular minute after every hour that the bus arrives).

Thus, depicting events that occur at particular minutes of particular hours is known in the art (as shown in Springfield BRS). Further, partitioning portions of an analog clock into event-on and event-off sections is known in the art (as shown in Parker). Additionally, expressing event times as a clock hand is known in the art (as demonstrated by Official Notice). Finally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine these known elements because it produces a predictable result (e.g. the bus schedule shown in Springfield BRS depicted on a clock face).

Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker in view of Springfield BRS, and further in view of U.S. pre-grant publication number 2004/0124977 to Biffar (“Biffar”).

Claim 17: Parker does not explicitly disclose displaying a plurality of the clock faces on a map, each clock face displayed at a different location to form a route on the map.

Biffar discloses displaying times at different locations to form a route on a map (see figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the clock faces taught by Parker for the times displayed on the route in the map of Biffar. This simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

Claim 18: Parker discloses:

- designating each event location with an analog clock face that depicts an event time corresponding to the event location (see figures 10-11)

Biffar discloses:

- receiving scheduling information including event times, event information, and event locations (see paragraph 38);
- accessing a map based on the event locations (see figure 3);
- integrating the event times, event information, and event locations into a schedule route on the map (see figure 3);
- displaying the schedule route on the map in a single spatial view (see figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the clock faces taught by Parker for the times displayed on the route in the map of Biffar. This simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

Claims 19-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker in view of Springfield BRS and Biffar, and further in view of U.S. patent number 6,321,158 to DeLorme et al (“DeLorme”).

Claim 19: Parker and Biffar do not explicitly disclose the limitations of this claim.

DeLorme discloses:

- receiving a user input instruction from a cursor hovering over an event time in the single spatial view (see column 43: line 63 through column 44: line 15); and
- in response to the user input instruction, displaying a pop-up pane containing underlying event information associated with the event time (see id.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the techniques taught by DeLorme to display information from the map of Biffar. This combination of known elements produces a result that would be predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g. viewing information by hovering a cursor over an item [similar to a ToolTip]).

Claim 20: Parker and Biffar do not explicitly disclose the limitations of this claim.

DeLorme discloses receiving user input through the pop-up pane that includes altered event information selected from the group comprising: edited event information; added event information; and deleted event information (see column 43: line 63 through column 44: line 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the techniques taught by DeLorme to edit information for the events of Biffar and Parker. This combination of known elements produces a result that would be predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g. editing event information through a pop-up panel).

Claim 22: Parker and Biffar do not explicitly disclose the limitations of this claim.

DeLorme discloses wherein the event locations can include local, regional, national, and international locations, the method further comprising: zooming the single spatial view between a local view, a regional view, a national view, and an international view according to a user input instruction; wherein each of the local view, regional view, national view, and international view include relevant event times, event information, and event locations (see column 44: lines 15-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the techniques taught by DeLorme to zoom between different views on the maps of Biffar. This combination of known elements produces a result that would be predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g. zoomable maps).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker in view of Springfield BRS, Biffar, and DeLorme, and further in view of U.S. patent number 5,790,974 to Tognazzini (“Tognazzini”).

Claim 21: Parker, Biffar, and DeLorme do not explicitly disclose the limitations of this claim.

Tognazzini discloses transferring altered event information from the single spatial view of the scheduling information to a calendar view of the scheduling information (see column 13: lines 23-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to share information as taught by Tognazzini between the schedule storage and maps disclosed by Biffar. This combination of known elements produces a result that would be predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g. synchronized updates).

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Parker, and further in view of Springfield BRS.

Claim 23: Claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 11-12, above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Dragicevic, Pierre and Stephane Huot. "SpiraClock: A Continuous and Non-Intrusive Display for Upcoming Events." CHI 2002 Conference on Human Factors in Computer Systems (April 2002).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil R. Kardos whose telephone number is (571) 270-3443. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Neil R. Kardos
Examiner
Art Unit 3623

NRK
1/26/09
/Jonathan G. Sterrett/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623